
The Index of Class Position: An Improved Intercommunity Measure of Stratification

Author(s): Robert A. Ellis, W. Clayton Lane and Virginia Olesen

Source: *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (Apr., 1963), pp. 271-277

Published by: [American Sociological Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2090614>

Accessed: 25-02-2016 23:26 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/2090614?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Sage Publications, Inc. and American Sociological Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Sociological Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

a reward attached to occupations." Respondents reported a number of criteria almost equally used as the "one main thing about such jobs that gives this standing." (Our results suggest there is far from one main thing.) In common with other studies, lower economic strata were more likely to emphasize the factual order and used income and security. Higher strata were more likely to focus on self-expression and "prestige" in the Weberian sense of a separate dimension. Kreisberg's evidence bolsters our suggestion that respondents often act like natural sociologists. In keeping with our findings of a general set of terms used in ranking (Middle-Working class and Successful-Unsuccessful) Kreisberg found that the variable of prestige accorded professionals was the most significant variable in explaining rating of dentists. Other perceived characteristics of the occupation, such as degree of skill or the utility of dentists, were not as crucial as knowledge of a hierarchy in which professionals had a high rating. As Kreisberg wrote, "It may be that a person accords an occupation high prestige because he knows *as a matter of fact* that most persons accord members of that occupation high prestige."

Both these findings and ours suggest there is a distinct possibility that in the study of occupational prestige we are not getting only the system of evaluations which respondents may use in judging occupations. Either we obtain the descriptions of a factual order, in which the existent fact that A is a "better" job than B is recognized, or we may be confronted with a "pluralistic ignorance" in which each respondent assumes that the factual order is a reflection of the normative order which others, not himself, possesses. In either case the ratings emerge as descriptive rather than evaluative or ambiguously both. Kreisberg's suggestion that people learn prestige ratings apart from imputation of any qualities or moral judgments of specific occupations is in line with our reasoning. Our data lead us to conclude that future studies that require judgments of prestige be designed in a manner that will permit the investigator to designate the amount of variance explained by each of the component elements of the judgment.

But the point is more than peripheral and methodological. It cuts to the heart of a major issue in sociology. Recent criticisms of functional theory have pointed out the conflict between perspectives which emphasize the individuals' adaptation to facts of power in institutional arrangements. If we assume that description is evaluation, we unwittingly approve or condemn rather than analyze. We find congruence where none has been displayed.

THE INDEX OF CLASS POSITION: AN IMPROVED INTERCOMMUNITY MEASURE OF STRATIFICATION *

ROBERT A. ELLIS

University of Oregon

W. CLAYTON LANE

San Jose State College

AND

VIRGINIA OLESEN

University of California, San Francisco Medical Center

The Index of Class Position (ICP) described in this paper was developed to provide an easily applied intercommunity measure of stratification that would improve upon the accuracy of estimating an individual's position in the class structure. The need for such a measure arose from research being done in the college setting, which often makes existing stratification procedures impracticable.

That college undergraduates characteristically establish residence on campus, often at a considerable distance from their homes, precludes employing a number of standard procedures. Eliminated by this consideration are: (1) the prestige rating technique in its various forms,¹ (2) Warner's Index of Status Characteristics,² and (3) socio-economic status scales of the Chapin and Sewell prototype³—all of which

* Revised version of a paper read at the annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association, April, 1962. The research has been supported by grants from the Society for the Investigation of Human Ecology, the Social Science Research Council, Stanford University Research Funds, and the National Institute of Mental Health (M-4968). Appreciation is expressed to Kenji Ima and John Koval for their assistance in analysis of the data. The authors are also indebted to Robert Dubin and William Robinson for their helpful suggestions in the revisions of the manuscript.

¹ Robert A. Ellis, "The Prestige Rating Technique in Community Stratification Research" in Richard N. Adams and Jack J. Preiss (eds.), *Human Organization Research*, Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1960. See also Milton M. Gordon, *Social Class in American Sociology*, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1958, pp. 135-151; Leonard Reissman, *Class in American Society*, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959, pp. 125-134.

² W. Lloyd Warner, Marcia Meeker, and Kenneth Eells, *Social Class in America*, Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949, pp. 121-230.

³ F. Stuart Chapin, "A Quantitative Scale for Rating the Home and Social Environment of Middle Class Families in an Urban Community," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 19 (February, 1928), pp. 99-111; *The Measurement of Social*

require direct access to the community or home.

The methodological alternatives are further curtailed by the fact that lower-class students are a minority in the college setting⁴ and are likely to have acquired many value and attitudinal characteristics of the middle class.⁵ This poses a serious question about the feasibility of single-factor indexes inasmuch as their predictive utility in large part stems from the presence of a sizeable lower class sharply differentiated from the middle class.⁶

Hollingshead's two-factor Index of Social Position (ISP)⁷ remains the only procedure in common use possibly exempt from these deficiencies. Its two components of occupation and education can be applied on a society-wide basis, and the validity of the composite index score exceeds that yielded by either factor

alone. Nevertheless, the utility of ISP is seriously reduced for our purposes by its inclusion of education as a component. One consequence is that the effect of education can no longer be analyzed independently of social class; this poses a serious limitation in the study of college students.⁸ A second consequence is to exacerbate the tendency of most indices to elevate the prestige of the professional. For instance, the weight given education means that all college professors are operationally defined as class I. The result is a confounding of the upper and upper-middle classes which can be a source of significant measurement error, especially in those more selective institutions where a substantial proportion of the students are from the upper class.

DEVELOPMENT OF ICP

In developing the Index of Class Position, we used occupation as a major component variable because: (1) occupation is consistently the highest correlate of social status; (2) the *prestige* of occupations is judged by the general population with a high degree of consensus; and (3) the prestige of a particular occupation is attached to individual incumbents of that position—although a person's actual social status can fall considerably above or below the modal prestige level of the occupation he holds.⁹ The latter discrepancy can be attributed to the operation of other status evaluations.¹⁰

⁸ The confounding effect of education in class measurement has also been cited as an impediment to investigations of social class factors in mental illness. See Howard E. Freeman, "Attitude toward Mental Illness among Relatives of Former Patients," *American Sociological Review*, 26 (February, 1961), pp. 59–66; and S. M. Mishler, "Social Class, Mental Illness, and American Psychiatry," *Millbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 37 (April, 1959), pp. 174–199.

⁹ Cf., Paul K. Hatt, "Occupation and Social Stratification," *American Journal of Sociology*, 55 (May, 1950), pp. 533–543.

¹⁰ At least three different, though not mutually exclusive, explanations can be advanced for this variation:

A. The first involves the concept of multiple group membership. People participate in a number of different social structures during any one period. The prestige levels of the various positions held are not evaluated in isolation, but rather as a totality—an holistic fact that is represented in Kingsley Davis's concept of "station," which is the total combination of prestige "scores" an individual receives for the cluster of positions occupied.

B. The second recognizes the existence of alternative modes of evaluation. An occupational incumbent is not judged exclusively in terms of the position he holds. He is also judged by the way he carries out the role mandates and by the

Status by the Use of the Social Status Scale, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1933; William H. Sewell, *The Construction and Standardization of a Scale for the Measurement of the Socio-Economic Status of Oklahoma Farm Families*, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College Agricultural Experiment Station, Technical Bulletin No. 9, 1940. See also George Lundberg, *Social Research* (2nd ed.), New York: Longmans, Green, 1943, pp. 288–309. For a critical survey of socio-economic status scales, see Milton M. Gordon, *op. cit.*, pp. 210–220, and Leonard Reissman, *op. cit.*, pp. 117–125.

⁴ There is, of course, considerable diversity among colleges and universities in the social composition of their student bodies. While in some schools, such as the one under study in the present report, the lower class represents only a small minority of the total enrollment, there are other institutions—particularly public junior colleges—where the lower class may in fact be in the majority. Cf., Burton R. Clark, *The Open Door College: A Case Study*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960, pp. 51–61; and Robert J. Havighurst and Bernice L. Neugarten, *Society and Education*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1957, pp. 251–257.

⁵ For a cogent discussion of the implications of reference group theory for social mobility, see Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Rev. Ed.), Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957, pp. 260–280, 288–297.

⁶ Support for this interpretation is furnished by the frequent practice of dichotomizing stratification indexes for tetrachoric correlation analysis without apparently seriously affecting the magnitude of the relationship under scrutiny. See, for example, Joseph A. Kahl and James A. Davis, "A Comparison of Indexes of Socio-Economic Status," *American Sociological Review*, 20 (June, 1955), pp. 317–325; Edwin D. Lawson and Walter E. Boek, "Correlations of Indexes of Families' Socio-Economic Status," *Social Forces*, 39 (December, 1960), pp. 149–152.

⁷ August B. Hollingshead, *Two-Factor Index of Social Position*, privately mimeographed, 1957.

The next step was to locate a suitable auxiliary factor that would provide a cross-community measure of an individual's style of life but would be free from the disadvantages of education as a status indicator. Kahl and Davis's analysis of socio-economic indexes suggested the feasibility of substituting Centers' measure of class identification for that of education.¹¹ These two factors are highly correlated and, when processed by factor and cluster analysis, constitute a statistically distinct subgroup in which components can be treated as interchangeable. Kahl and Davis's data also allay some doubts about the validity of fixed categories for gaining information on "class identification."¹² They find not only that respondents can, and do, class-type themselves in meaningful and systematic fashion with Centers' question but also that such a closed-answer procedure proves superior to one that is open ended.¹³

Still another contribution of Kahl and Davis's research is their demonstration of the feasibility of relying on a more refined set of rating categories than Centers had done for distinguishing among the upper, middle, and lower levels of the middle class. This extension of Centers'

extra-role personal qualities he possesses. These two additional modes of evaluation, which can be designated as *esteem* and *admiration* judgments, serve to reinforce or modify the initial *prestige* gained for incumbency of the occupation.

C. A third possible explanation is provided by the premise that social status is capable of being transferred among individuals (as well as positions). Status transfer can occur within a given generation, as for example when a wife's status within a community is higher or lower than her husband's, or it can occur intergenerationally in the form of lineage.

See John W. Bennet and Melvin M. Tumin, *Social Life: Structure and Function*, New York: Alfred M. Knopf, 1949, pp. 108-109; Kingsley Davis, "Conceptual Analysis of Stratification," *American Sociological Review*, 7 (June, 1942), pp. 309-321; Kingsley Davis, *Human Society*, New York: Macmillan, 1949; Robert A. Ellis and Thomas C. Keedy, Jr., "Three Dimensions of Status: A Study of Academic Prestige," *Pacific Sociological Review*, 3 (Spring, 1960), pp. 23-28; Milton Gordon, *op. cit.*, pp. 175-177, 245-246; Paul K. Hatt, "Stratification in the Mass Society," *American Sociological Review*, 15 (April, 1950), pp. 216-222; Albert J. Reiss, Jr., *Occupations and Social Status*, New York: Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961, pp. 140-151.

¹¹ Kahl and Davis, *op. cit.*

¹² Cf., Neal Gross, "Social Class Identification in the Urban Community," *American Sociological Review*, 18 (August, 1953), pp. 398-404.

¹³ Kahl and Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 325.

procedure from a four-point to a six-point scale serves to increase the validity of class placement possible.

On the basis of these considerations, the decision was made to use occupation and class identification as the two components of the Index of Class Position. The first component is measured by Hollingshead's seven-point scale of occupational prestige, a rationally derived modification of the Alba Edwards' scale.¹⁴ With college students, occupational data are gathered on the students' fathers—the assumption being made that the class status of a college undergraduate is at this stage of his career primarily ascribed by the family.¹⁵

Data on class identification are obtained by a procedure closely patterned after Kahl and Davis's modification of Centers' question which, by its threefold partition of middle-class status, allows a more refined series of class judgments. The class identification question is phrased as follows for use with college students:

An American social scientist has made a study of the United States which indicated that in this country there are four major social classes: the Middle, the Lower, the Working, and the Upper social classes. In which of these social classes would you say your family belongs?

[If answer is middle, then probe question is asked].

Would you say your family belongs to the Upper-Middle, Middle-Middle, or Lower-Middle social class?

Replies are numerically weighted so as to yield a five-point scale ranging from a score of one for upper class to a score of five for working class. No final decision has been reached concerning the weight to be assigned the sixth

¹⁴ August B. Hollingshead, *Two-Factor Index of Social Position*, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-8; August B. Hollingshead and Frederick C. Redlich, *Social Class and Mental Illness: A Community Study*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958, pp. 390-391.

¹⁵ The task of gaining occupational information in adequate detail to insure reliable and reasonably accurate coding is more difficult than the stratification literature would indicate. Our experience has shown a minimum of 15 questions needs to be used. Even with these safeguards, some guesswork is involved in using Hollingshead's scale for occupational classification. While indicative of the need for still further refinement in occupational measurement, the objectivity of Hollingshead's procedure compares favorably with alternative scales. For example, for the Stanford data (N=194) reported in this paper the percentage of instances guesswork was involved in occupational classification by four selected occupational scales was as follows:

Hollingshead	09%
Centers	11%
Warner	17%
North-Hatt	36%

category of lower class, since it has only been rarely used by college students in the researches we have done. Until such time as empirical evidence can be presented to corroborate Centers' thesis that a lower-class response is a distinct status level below that of working class, our suggestion is to treat the two as numerically equivalent.

Class identification and occupational scores are summated to yield a total ICP score ranging from 2 to 12.¹⁶ These scores are divided to obtain the six class levels presented in Table 1.

The use of a total ICP score of 2 for designating a class I position means that for a person to qualify as class I with this index the head of household must be a proprietor of a large concern or must have a high-level managerial or professional position; and, in addition, his status circumstances must be perceived by the son or daughter (or, in theory, by himself) as upper class. On face validity, this seems a realistic requirement for upper-class status and far preferable to the situation in which all large proprietors and professional or high-level managerial people are automatically class-typed as being in the top social stratum.

At the lower range of ICP scores, the 9-10 division separates the lower class from the lower-middle. Thus, for a person to be categorized in the lower strata, he must be employed in a blue-collar occupation and must be perceived by the son or daughter (or, in theory, by himself) as working class. This offers a far more realistic basis for demarcating the lower class than is ordinarily the case. It considers the fact that in our society, with its high rate of geographic movement, its high standard of living, and a general faith in the intergenerational opportunity for success, the blue collar-white collar division is far from fixed and disparate. That a person is a blue-collar worker is not, by itself, sufficient grounds to place him in the lower stratum. In other respects he may have acquired a middle-class orientation to the world around him, so that other persons will view him as middle class and, in turn, he will regard himself as such. Consequently, he would be distinguished from other blue-collar workers who perceive themselves as situated in lower- or working-class circumstances.

Thus, underlying the ICP procedure are two major assumptions. The first is that social status—and, hence, class position—is a perceptual phenomenon based on the mutual evaluations people make of each other's social importance in the community or society. The cues for these

TABLE 1. CLASS LEVELS ARRANGED BY ICP SCORES

ICP Level	Range of Scores	Social Class
I	2	Upper
II	3-4	Upper-middle
III	5-7	Middle
IV	8-9	Lower-middle
V	10	Upper-lower
VI	11-12	Lower-lower

evaluations are provided by the symbolic manifestation of a culturally defined, group-shared style of life. Occupation is useful as a stratification indicator, but its invariability in the individual case needs to be offset by some additional factor sensitive to many other considerations that contribute to the over-all social status a person is accorded. This, it would seem is the merit of relying on class identification as the second component of ICP: it provides a means for estimating the respondent's own definition of his status situation, which by the additional assumption of a "looking glass self" conception of status, should mirror the status assigned the individual by the larger community or society.

VALIDATION OF ICP

At the minimum, two conditions have to be satisfied before use of ICP as a stratification technique is empirically warranted. Evidence is needed, first, that ICP does measure the phenomenon of social class and, second, that it does so demonstrably better than the ISP procedure it was developed to replace.

Method. Data for these tests were gathered in the course of interviews with 194 Stanford freshmen soon after their matriculation in the fall of 1958. Of this total, 160 (99 males and 61 females) were selected by means of a standard probability sample. The remaining 34 students (27 males and 7 females) represent an oversample taken of all other freshman matriculants not included in the original sample who were in the three bottom class levels of ICP. The latter step was necessitated by the decided skewness of the Stanford population toward the upper-middle class. The oversample is included in the analysis to follow so as to provide a broader range of status inequalities.

Questions asked of the students about their family and themselves, as well as giving data for stratifying the sample by ICP and ISP, furnished six simply dichotomized stratification correlates that were used as validation criteria.¹⁷

¹⁶ A product moment correlation of .70 was obtained between the two scales in the present study.

¹⁷ Essentially, we are testing the construct validity of ICP. (Cf., Lee J. Cronbach and Paul E. Meehl, "Construct Validity in Psychological Tests," *Psy-*

These attributes, stated in their positive form, are listed below:

1. Attending college on scholarship.
2. Having a mother who is employed outside the home.¹⁸
3. Clear expectations by student of having a job better than his father's.¹⁹
4. Affiliation with a high-status Protestant denomination (i.e., Congregational, Episcopal, or Presbyterian).²⁰
5. Graduation from a nonparochial private secondary school.
6. Being a relative of a Stanford alumnus.

Results. Before analyzing the validation results, let us first turn to the relationship ICP and ISP bear to one another.²¹ As might be expected from their common base in Hollingshead's occupational scale, the two are highly correlated ($r=.86$). But despite this close correspondence, the indexes are far from identical. This can readily be seen by examination of Table 2 which presents the joint frequency distribution of ICP and ISP. The modification introduced in Hollingshead's procedure has resulted in a shift of class position for 109 of the 193 subjects.²² The two main points of incongruity between the indexes are found, as intended, at the upper and lower-middle class levels. Only 27 per cent of individuals classified as I by ISP are so classified by ICP, and

only 35 per cent of the class IV students by Hollingshead's procedure are typed as Class IV by ICP. On the other hand, two thirds of the students in the remaining class levels of ISP are similarly categorized by both indexes.

While these changes are in the direction intended, it still remains to be demonstrated that the result is an improvement in stratification measurement. For this task, ICP and ISP were compared on their ability to predict the distribution of the six stratification correlates used as validating criteria. Each criterion, after being dichotomized, was cross-tabulated by each index and the level of association computed by Goodman and Kruskal's gamma (γ)—a coefficient that takes "distributed order" as well as statisti-

TABLE 2. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ICP AND ISP *

ICP Class	ISP Class				
	I	II	III	IV	V
I	21	1	1	—	—
II	54	23	5	—	—
III	4	12	21	3	—
IV	—	—	7	13	1
V	—	—	—	20	—
VI	—	—	—	1	6

* N = 193. On one subject, data on father's education were not available for computation of ISP.

chological Bulletin, 52 [July, 1955], pp. 281-302). This validity test does not require demonstrating a one-to-one correspondence between ICP and any single empirical indicator, but rather that there is a generally consistent relationship between ICP and the total set of social, cultural, and economic correlates of class position which have been sampled. Without an agreed upon universe of stratification correlates, the choice of validating criteria is of necessity somewhat arbitrary and the sampling, imperfect. Some justification for the specific choices made can be found in the stratification literature, but perhaps the best single evidence favoring their use is provided post hoc by the findings in Tables 4 and 5 that each criterion does bear a strong and systematic relationship to the two indexes of social class.

¹⁸ Students from broken homes were excluded from analysis since this factor, independently of social status, importantly contributed to the likelihood a mother would be working.

¹⁹ This information was collected only from male respondents.

²⁰ The analysis of high-status Protestants was restricted to the Protestant members of the sample.

²¹ An ISP score could not be computed for one student because of lack of information about the education of the student's father. For this reason, the sample N is reduced by one for all comparisons made between ICP and ISP.

²² To facilitate comparison, classes V and VI by ICP were treated as a single unit.

cal dependence into account.²³ The results are found in Table 3.

The uniformly high coefficients obtained throughout give ample evidence that ICP scores do not represent an idiosyncratic combination of subscale scores but instead are tapping, along with their ISP counterparts, a general dimension of social stratification.

The data demonstrate some statistical advantage for ICP on four of the six validation criteria, the gamma coefficients for ICP being from five to nineteen points higher than for ISP. On the remaining two criteria (having relatives who are Stanford alumni and the student's expecting a job better than his father's), only negligible differences are found between the two indexes.

The implications of relying upon ICP for class measurement are brought out more fully in Table 4, where percentage distributions of students by ICP and ISP are compared by selected stratification correlates. To the six already in use has been added a seventh, that of having a father with graduate training beyond

²³ Leo A. Goodman and William H. Kruskal, "Measure of Association for Cross-classifications," *Journal of American Statistical Association*, 49 (December, 1954), pp. 732-764.

TABLE 3. GAMMA COEFFICIENTS MEASURING ASSOCIATION OF ICP AND ISP WITH SIX SELECTED STRATIFICATION CORRELATES

Stratification Index	Students Who Are:					
	On Scholarship	[Have] Mothers Who Are Working *	Expecting Job Better Than Their Father's**	High Status Protestants ***	Private School Graduates	Relatives of Stanford Alumni
ICP	— .76	— .54	— .79	.61	.81	.52
ISP	— .59	— .49	— .80	.54	.60	.50

* Students from broken homes were not included in the computation of γ . N of students from intact homes = 166.

** Computed only for male students. N of males = 125.

*** Non-Protestants were not included in the computation of γ . N of Protestants = 151.

the baccalaureate. This criterion differs from previous ones in that it can be premised on *a priori* grounds to bear a curvilinear relation to social class, its effect being concentrated in the upper-middle class. Because of this postulated curvilinearity, it was not included in the statistical analysis above.

Examination of Table 4 indicates that in large part the superiority of ICP with the

present data can be traced to the greater accuracy with which the upper class is delineated. Consistently, ICP prevents our drawing substantive conclusions contrary to present stratification knowledge. For example, the ICP data, unlike that obtained with ISP, show that private school preparation for college is a predominantly upper-class trait and that parental graduate training—the hallmark of the upper-middle class

TABLE 4. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS BY ICP AND ISP ON SELECTED CORRELATES OF STRATIFICATION

Per Cent of Students Who Are:	Class Level					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1. On Scholarship						
ICP	00	30	58	76	90	86
ISP	27	33	59	78	86	—
2. [Have] Mothers Who Are Working*						
ICP	05	20	35	58	44	60
ISP	12	36	35	52	40	—
3. Expecting a Job Better Than Their Father's**						
ICP	08	45	67	94	93	100
ISP	26	61	72	96	100	—
4. High Status Protestants***						
ICP	74	71	41	40	13	00
ISP	69	62	56	15	14	—
5. Private School Graduates						
ICP	43	16	00	05	00	00
ISP	20	19	00	03	00	—
6. Relatives of Stanford Alumni						
ICP	70	39	25	24	05	14
ISP	49	44	18	16	00	—
7. [With] Father's Having Graduate Education						
ICP	39	51	28	05	00	00
ISP	63	31	09	00	00	—
Number of Cases						
ICP	23	82	40	21	20	07
ISP	79	36	34	37	07	—

* Students from broken homes were excluded from analysis. Corrected N for ICP is: 22, 71, 31, 19, 18, 5; for ISP, corrected N is: 69, 33, 26, 33, 5.

** Computed only for males. N for ICP is: 12, 49, 26, 16, 15, 7; N for ISP is 43, 23, 25, 27, 7.

*** Computed only for Protestants. Corrected N for ICP is 19, 68, 27, 15, 15, 7; corrected N for ISP is: 65, 26, 27, 26, 7.

professional—is found concentrated in the upper-middle class. That only one out of twelve class I males, as measured by ICP, expects to have a job better than his father's would appear a "truer" upper-class response than the one-out-of-four figure yielded by Hollingshead's index. Similarly, the sharp differentiation ICP provides between class I and II students having Stanford alumni as relatives reflects more accurately than ISP's results the ascriptive basis of upper-class status.

Table 4 also reveals that the general superiority of ICP in differentiating the upper class is gained without sacrifice of capacity to differentiate subordinate class levels. On all but one validating criteria, essentially comparable distributions of the lower strata are given by both indexes. The one exception is that of being a high-status Protestant. On this criterion, ICP shows an abrupt break between classes IV and V—theoretically, the point demarcating the middle and lower classes—while ISP locates the point of disjuncture between classes III and IV. Except for the greater sharpness of the status cleavages yielded by ICP, little basis exists for choosing one point of demarcation over the other. These findings indicate that even at the lower range of the status order differentially interpretable results can be generated by the two techniques.

CONCLUSION

This paper has introduced an improved inter-community measure of social stratification, offered a rationale for its development, and presented evidence confirming the validity of its use. While the discussion has focused on the college setting, where there has been a specific need for a class index that combines cross-community flexibility with a high degree of predictive utility, ICP may prove useful in other research areas.

A NOTE ON "STUDENT ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF WAR"

DAVID WRENCH

University of Oregon

In a recent study Putney and Middleton found acceptance of war among students "positively associated with interest and involvement in modern society, with knowledge and realism concerning nuclear war, and with a sense that war is probable."¹ This positive association of

awareness of the dangers of war and willingness to accept it is supported by certain findings emerging from an experiment conducted at the University of Oregon during the academic year 1961–1962.² The subjects were 96 students of both sexes in an introductory psychology course.

After participating in the experimental portion of the study, which used a rumor transmission technique, the subjects rated themselves against a hypothesized normal distribution of other University of Oregon students in each of two areas. The specific questions they responded to were as follows: 1. "Please rate yourself on how aggressive a stand you take in international relations. . . . Favor tougher, more aggressive policy than what percent of U of O students?" 2. "Rate yourself on how dangerous you think the world situation is. . . . See the situation as more dangerous and threatening than what percent of U of O students?" For my sample these two self ratings are positively correlated, with $r = +.30$. This relationship is significant at the .01 level. Although not large in absolute terms, it is quite sizeable considering the rather low reliability of self ratings. (The self ratings of "aggression" and "danger" have uncorrected test-retest reliability coefficients of .65 and .55 respectively.)

The study also provides data on another interesting question related to student attitudes about international relations. To predict political action from attitudes, it is necessary to know not only the attitudes held but also their intensity. Following early work by Cantril,³ it is frequently assumed that there is a curvilinear relationship between attitudinal position and intensity such that people holding extreme attitudes in either direction will hold them with highest intensity.

There are attitude domains, however, where it does not seem reasonable that this should be the case. To cite one obvious example, a person with paranoid tendencies might be quite convinced that people were following him around the city and feel very strongly about this belief. Another person without these tendencies might be equally convinced that people were not following him, but have no strong affective component to the belief. In other words, where one attitude extreme implies a strong need for action while the opposite extreme implies no such need, a linear relationship between attitudinal position and strength of feeling might be expected.

² The study is supported by the Office of Scientific and Scholarly Research of the University of Oregon.

³ Hadley Cantril, "The Intensity of an Attitude," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 41 (1946), pp. 129–135.

¹ *American Sociological Review*, 27 (October, 1962), p. 655.